

June 1, 1973

bill with far better protections can be brought out of committee I think is a sound argument. I don't think that it is wise to go ahead with this as a foot in the door when we have already put 20 million dollars into that door. It seems to me that we have to respect the tax payer and the average citizen, the laborer and the worker, the renter, the housewife at the grocery store, or in addition to the needs for education. When we can honestly stand before the people of this state and our district and say that we have substantially increased the amount of money that goes into education we have done a great deal. Next it seems to me that we have to protect the people that need protection. Therefore I think for at least for me that I am pleased that LB172 stands and I think that will be carried forward and I also intend to vote against the override. I intend to push the red button and I would suggest to those of you who think you represent renters that those of you who think that you represent farmers, then those of you who think that you represent housewives at grocery stores, people with families wage earners and people who pay property taxes on their homes and people who get a letter once a year from their mortgage company saying this year your mortgage payment goes up so many dollars and the notation is it is additional property taxes, I think until the proper relief and safeguards are put into here for these interest groups which to me represent the people of this state, if you represent the same people that I represent, it seems to me that the logical thing for you to do is to vote red and to sustain the veto.

PRESIDENT: Senator Keyes then Kelly, Proud, Cavanaugh.

SENATOR KEYES: Mr. President, I would like to ask Senator Warner a question.

PRESIDENT: Senator Warner, would you yield?

SENATOR KEYES: Senator Warner, this pretains to the bill and I think that it is of interest because the Governor of the state of Nebraska has objected to the bill on one of these grounds. After this bill is in effect for two years there is no control on the cost of education, is that right?

SENATOR WARNER: Senator Keyes as pointed initially the obvious answer to your question is that each session of the

(end belt #5)

(start belt #6)

legislature whether it was in there permanently or not, would have to review because of the first the unknown of inflation whether it will go up, down or remain stable. We know that there appears to be a reduction in enrollment, and these are factors which are going to require adjustments. Annually, I would point out to you that 448 when it was passed in 67 did have a permanent one, which it went all of the following session to say that if you had a limitation in 472 that was permanent, obviously would be pure speculation because any succeeding legislature could adjust it. In addition there is no question in my mind what the legislature when the state is providing the percent of support that will be required therefore 472 are going to be insistant that some type of reasonable limitations continue.

SENATOR KEYES: Alright Senator Warner, there is no control then after two years except as the Legislature sees fit to enact legislation. Now during the first two years I am interested